UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/824,940	04/15/2004	Max Stern	STN.PAT.25	7551	
	30733 7590 02/29/2008 Jeffrey C. Maynard			EXAMINER	
154 Barbara Ro	ad	AHMED, MASUD			
Severna Park, MD 21146			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/29/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/824,940	STERN, MAX
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MASUD AHMED	3714
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutoreriod Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 A This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration. or election requirement.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	a) accepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/824,940 Page 2

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: at step (F) if certain condition is not met, applicant is claiming to repeat steps (D) through (F) where (F) itself is part of the step (F). Applicant should add an additional step to separate repeating step from step (F). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. At step (F) if certain condition is not met, applicant is claiming to repeat steps (D) through (F), which is also part of step (F); therefore it is not clear how the steps should be followed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pennington (US 2004/0043807).

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 13, Pennington teaches a video poker game system having following limitations:

Page 3

Providing a set of contest elements for a poker game with playing indicia on the surface; displaying an initial poker hand; displaying a predetermined number of contest elements to each participant; evaluating the combination of elements in each slot or poker hands for winning hand with the first table of values (para 0054); if its not an winning hand then display number of contest elements at a predetermined number of times (para 0056); give players option to elect or discard the cards for the second hands of play without additional wagers; determine the winning combination of the symbol and award the player accordingly (para 0009, 0010, 0012). However, Pennington is silent on disclosing additional hand of symbol elements to the player and if its non-winning combination then letting player to elect or discard the choices of cards for a winning hand. Pennington's teaching includes players given second chance if the player is not satisfied with the first initial hand, which is merely an obvious variation of giving players multiple chances to win a poker hand. Therefore it would have been obvious to ordinary skilled artisan at the time of invention to include multiple chances instead of just giving player once second chance to win a poker hand and create pay variation so that can create excitement among players and at the same time makes the game profitable for the casino.

Regarding claim 2, Pennington teaches players are paid if the winning combination is matched (para 0054), which is considered to be first table of value and

Art Unit: 3714

second chance winning combination is considered to be second table of values (para 0056), since the winning combination both can be different from each other.

Regarding claim 3, Pennington teaches winning combination are based on an accepted standard poker hand ranking (para 0051).

Regarding claim 4, Pennington teaches the combinations are determined for five card poker hands (para 0051).

Regarding claim 5, Pennington teaches a single deck is used for each five-card poker hand, however Pennington does makes a suggestion of having different number of cards or decks can be used (para 0051, para 0052).

Regarding claim 6, Pennington teaches each hand of cards are associated with its own deck of cards (para 0052).

Regarding claim 7, Pennington teaches the video poker game system can be played on an electro-mechanical or electronic video game machine (FIG 1 B), and a hand-held mechanical or electrical device is an obvious variation of this invention.

Regarding claim 9, Pennington teaches a means for player to wager on the machine (FIG 1B #12).

Regarding claim 10, Pennington teaches a touch screen control device where player can select indicia (para 0049).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Pennington teaches player can select indicia by pressing buttons and display is an electromechanical device (para 0051).

Art Unit: 3714

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MASUD AHMED whose telephone number is (571)270-1315. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm, Alt Fri, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571 272 7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert E Pezzuto/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/M. A./ Examiner, Art Unit 3714 Application/Control Number: 10/824,940

Page 6

Art Unit: 3714